

**COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY
e-COURT SUBCOMMITTEE
APPELLATE COURTS SUBTEAM
MEETING SUMMARY**

February 3, 2011
2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

State Courts Building Room 415

**SUPREME COURT MEMBERS
PRESENT**

Justice Andrew Hurwitz*
Clerk Rachelle Resnick
Staff Attorney Ellen Crowley

**APPEALS DIVISION ONE
MEMBERS PRESENT**

Chief Judge Ann Timmer
Judge Larry Winthrop
Clerk Ruth Willingham

**APPEALS DIVISION TWO MEMBERS
PRESENT**

Clerk Jeff Handler*

AOC STAFF PRESENT

Stewart Bruner, *ITD*
Karl Heckart, *ITD*
Jim Price, *ITD*

* indicates appeared via telephone

CHANGE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

Jim Price announced the drafting of a procedural document to control updates to the AZTurboCourt application as well as to provide criteria for cycling updates through the various test environments into production. Karl Heckart outlined the need for a pre-approval process before instructing the vendor to make enhancements to the software. The ultimate goal of the procedures is to reduce contract disputes. Karl clarified that issues regarding priorities or need for certain enhancements would still make their way to e-Court for resolution.

TURBOCOURT APPELLATE E-FILING

Clerk Rachelle Resnick provided numbers of filings received by TurboCourt for the Supreme Court and Division One to date. The AZTurboCourt patch needed to enable filing of criminal cases from the Attorney General is scheduled to be applied February 22. It will enable an influx of no-fee filings, greatly increasing case volume for the appellate courts. How soon afterwards AZTurboCourt can be opened for general appellate users is a function of the number of issues and time needed by the vendor to resolve them.

Justice Hurwitz requested a clear timeline at the next meeting for the resolutions of the issues that preclude expansion. Karl stated that, though he hadn't examined the list in detail or heard the vendor's response to it, the plan to expand appellate use to match the Maricopa mandatory timeline in May shouldn't be in jeopardy. Representatives agreed that the software is capable of performing case initiation in the interim. Karl also suggested that mandatory e-filing in Division Two be timed to coincide with mandatory e-filing at Pima Superior Court.

Justice Hurwitz then shared an idea to expand civil filings by reaching out to State Bar Appellate Section lawyers. Rachelle will contact Kim DeMarchi at Lewis and Roca to start the education process. Members also agreed to transition the three public defenders' offices using ACE to AZTurboCourt.

PRIORITIZING APPELLATE AUTOMATION ENHANCEMENTS

Rachelle displayed the list of necessary and desired enhancements to TurboCourt, Appellation and C2C compiled by the Supreme Court and Division One. It is arranged by deadline lengths: 20 items now, 14 within 6 months, and 13 within 12 months. Karl requested a separate meeting with the clerks to understand the specifics and business value of the items. He reminded members that automation resources are limited so items must be prioritized carefully with consideration given for short-term work that may be obviated by longer term work. An example is spreading C2C to rural counties when direct access to the record will eventually be made using the CDR. Justice Hurwitz added that increasing the breadth of AZTurboCourt is the clear number one priority.

OTHER UPDATES AND ISSUES

Rachelle raised an issue about juvenile severance filings from the Attorney General being submitted electronically when the AO and 1-506 forbid e-filing of sealed or restricted documents. Stewart Bruner agreed to include the change to 1-506(E)(4) as part of the alignment with the revised Rule 124. For the moment, sealed or confidential documents must be filed on paper.

Jim Price raised an issue related to TurboCourt's lack of role-based filing in the situation where a private attorney filing on behalf of a government entity is still charged the application fee. Justice Hurwitz felt that for simplicity sake (because a profile is currently tied to a single role) the attorney should be charged in that instance. Even with the fee, an overall cost saving still exists with e-filing, as described in Michael Jeanes' early communications to attorneys about Maricopa's local e-filing effort.

Judge Timmer asked for clarification about appellate members' attendance at the "all hands" e-Court meeting scheduled for February 11.

WRAP UP

A follow-up meeting will be scheduled during the first week in March to report on the timeline for addressing priority issues.

Meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.